

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 03 2006

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1-22 remain pending in the present application. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22, and that claims 6 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-14, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. (See 6/15/06 Office Action, ¶ 3, p. 3). Specifically, the Examiner contends that the recitation "determining a compression size for each of the segments, wherein the compression size varies based on a number of bits needed to represent relative distances between the points of each segment," which is recited in independent claims 1, 18 and 21, is not described in the specification of the present application.

As described in the specification, compression of a signature involves dividing the signature into a number of data points corresponding to a segment size, S. (See Specification, p. 6, lines 6-8). A compressor determines how many bits are required to represent each coordinate of each of the data points. (Id. at p. 6, lines 9-11). The specification goes on to explain that representation of each coordinate is done by converting DrawTo data to relative-movement data. (Id. at p. 6, lines 25-26). In an example, four signature points, (25, 800), (130, 1003), (182, 1620) and (182, 1678), are converted to relative movement coordinates, (0,0), (105, 203), (52, 617) and (0, 58). (Id. at p. 7, lines 10-18). Thus, the signature is described in terms of a reference point (e.g., (0, 0)) and a movement required to reach a subsequent point (e.g., 105 in the x direction and 203 in the y direction) rather than describing the signature in terms of absolute coordinates. The relative distance between the absolute coordinates is inherently

represented by the relative coordinates. In order to reach the subsequent point, a relative distance in the x and y directions must be traversed—these relative distances are expressed in the x and y values of the relative coordinates. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the recitations of claims 1, 18 and 21 are fully supported by the specification and the rejection should be withdrawn.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 12-15, 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,091,975 to Berger et al. (the “Berger patent”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,748,904 to Huang et al. (the “Huang patent”). (See 6/15/06 Office Action, ¶ 5, p. 3).

The Berger patent describes a method of compressing a signature signal, which is divided into a plurality of segments. (See Berger patent, abstract). A computer divides the signature signal into the plurality of segments, such that each segment is encoded using a modified ring-encoding technique and represented using eight bits. (See Berger patent, col. 3, lines 21-26).

The Huang patent describes a method for compressing graphic data by dividing the data into segments. Each segment is compressed using three algorithms that encode the data as a plurality of code-words. Each code-word for the segment is taken from the algorithm that can compress the largest number of pixels in the code-word. (See Huang patent, abstract). A compressor 5 contains three encoders: a run length encoder 51, a run index encoder 52, and a bit-map encoder 53. (Id. at col. 3, lines 38-40). Code-words are generated by each encoder and the code-word that can compress the largest number of pixels is used as the compressed data. (Id. at col. 3, lines 52-55).

Claim 1 of the present application is directed to a method for compressing the representation of points in a space, which includes “*dividing a sequence of points into segments of successive points*” and “*determining a compression size for each of the segments, wherein the compression size varies based on a number of bits needed to represent relative distances*”

between the points of each segment” and “compressing each of the segments into the compression size for each segment.” According to the specification, a sequence of points is divided into segments of size S. For compression, one segment may require many bits to represent a coordinate (e.g., a large relative movement from an origin or a previous point to the coordinate), whereas a small relative movement may require only a few bits. (See Specification, ¶ [0031]). Thus, “each segment of data is compressed, using only the number of bits required for that segment.” (Id at ¶ [0043]). As recited in claim 1, “wherein the compression size varies based on a number of bits needed to represent relative distances between the points of each segment.”

The Examiner has attempted to cure the deficiencies of the Berger patent with the Huang patent by stating that Huang defines sizes (e.g., 128, 256, 512, or 1024 bytes) for the compressed segments and that therefore, the compression size varies depending on the number of bytes. (See 6/15/06 Office Action, p. 4). However, these sizes merely specify a size for each **uncompressed** segment. The Huang patent teaches that graphic data should be divided into segments which are compressed using different algorithms, the smallest outputs of which are selected to represent the segments. The segments are compressed pixel-by-pixel and the code-word which compresses the largest number of pixels is used as the compressed data. (See Huang patent, col. 3, lines 51-55). Compression fails if the size of the compressed data is larger than a predetermined compressed segment size. (Id at col. 3, lines 4-7). Thus, the size of the compressed segments is **not fixed** and varies based on the **algorithm selected** rather than on “a number of bits needed to represent relative distances between the points of each segment.” In contrast, the present application claims that a segment (i.e., a sequence of points in a space) can be further divided into smaller segments. The encoding of these smaller segments is compressed in accordance with the amount of bits needed to represent the relative distance between points corresponding to the smaller segments. A segment size S can be varied, and the value of S that results in the best compression is chosen. (Id at ¶¶ [0030]-[0033]). The compressed smaller segments are then combined to form a representation of the original segment. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that neither the Berger patent nor the Huang patent, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest

“determining a compression size for each of the segments, wherein the compression size varies based on a number of bits needed to represent relative distances between the points of each segment,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of claim 1. Because claims 2-5, 7-10 and 12-15 depend from and, therefore, include the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the reasons stated above.

Independent claim 18 includes substantially the same limitations as claim 1 including “determining a compression size for each of the segments, wherein the compression size varies based on a number of bits needed to represent relative distances between the points of each segment.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable for the same reasons stated above with reference to claim 1, and the Examiner should withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent claim 21 includes substantially the same limitations as claim 1 including “determining a compression size for each of the segments, wherein the compression size varies based on a number of bits needed to represent relative distances between the points of each segment.” Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable for the same reasons stated above with reference to claim 1, and the Examiner should withdraw the rejection of this claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, and an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 3, 2006

By: 

Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 45,559)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276